



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIĻING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/039,993	01/04/2002	Robert Hines	1889.001.US	8601
7	590 07/29/2004		EXAMINER	
Brian Beverly			CRIARES, THEODORE J	
Suite 2360 One Kaiser Pla	za		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Oakland, CA	94612		1617	
			DATE MAILED: 07/29/200-	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/039,993	HINES ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Theodore J. Criares	1617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	n the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by so Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rent. n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirtyeriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tatute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	04 January 2002.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐	This action is non-final.					
•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	ndrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐	accepted or b) ☐ objected to b	y the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	•	•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for form a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in Ap priority documents have been r reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Su	immary (PTO-413)				
 2) Notice of Preferences Cited (PTO-992) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date) Paper No(s)	/Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1617

CLAIMS 1-27 ARE PRESENTED FOR EXAMINATION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 4 -6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duckett et al. (6,007,824) and Lowrey (5,731,339)

Duckett et al. disclose at column 1, lines 33-67 the administration of sildenafil in tablet form within the amounts set forth by applicants claims is administered to a patient for the treatment of male erectile dysfunction.

Lowery teaches at column 3, lines 45-58 the use of papaverine in the treatment of erectile dysfunction. It is to be noted that applicant in his examples are using commercial tablets having the claimed amounts of papaverine to exemplify his

Art Unit: 1617

invention. In view of the above the amounts set forth in claims3, 4, 5 and 6 would have been within the skill and knowledge of a pharmacist.

As stated in In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 205 USPQ 1069, at page 1072 (CCPA 1980):

"It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. In re Susi, 58 CCPA 1074, 1079-80, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 426 (1971); In re Crockett, 47 CCPA 1018, 1020-21, 279 F.2d 274, 276-277, 126 USPQ 186, 188 (CCPA 1960). As this court explained in Crockett, the idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art."

In this application it would have been prima facie obvious to administer papaverine and sildenafil to treat male erectile dysfunction.

Claims 3, 7-13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duckett et al. (6,007,824 and Lowrey (5,731,339) in view of Doherty, Jr.(6,037,346). These claims add pentoxifylline to the composition for the treatment of erectile dysfunction.

The combination of sildenafil and papaverine to treat erectile dysfunction is obviated under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as set forth above. Dohertty, Jr. et al discloses the use of pentoxifylline at column 3, lines 20-37 in the treatment of erectile dysfunction. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to add pentoxifylline to the composition of sildenafil and papaverine since Dohertty, Jr. discloses that this compound has utility in the treatment of erectile dysfunction. The addition of a zinc compound in the form of zinc monomethionine aspartate of claims 14-24, 26 and 27

Art Unit: 1617

would have been within the skill of the pharmacist since the applicants admit at page 5, line 23 to page 6, line 11 that zinc is known to increase the blood flow into the penis.

The individual active agents are known as set forth above to treat erectile dysfunction. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the known claimed agents to achieve the desired results. There is a lack of data to support a finding that the individual agents when combined would produce merely an additive effect. There is no data to compare the effect of zinc and sildenafil alone in the treatment of erectile dysfunction. The data has been reviewed but fails to provide evidence of a synergistic effect.

The test of obviousness is "whether the teachings of the prior art, taken as a whole, would have made obvious the claimed invention." In re Gorman, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ 2d 1885, (Fed. Cir. 1991). In view of the above rejection it is deemed that the evidence presented has established a prima facie case of obviousness. is presented.

None of the claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theodore J. Criares whose telephone number is (571) 272-0625. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 A.M. to 5:00P.M. Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax

Art Unit: 1617

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Theodore J. Criares Primary Examiner

7/27/04 tjc